UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,011	07/23/2003	Abraham B. de Waal	NVDA/P000654	9953

26291   7590   10/26/2010
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P. NJ Office
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER
TRAN, TUYETLIEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/626,011	DE WAAL, ABRAHAM B.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUYETLIEN T. TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 August 2010</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>52-70</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>52-70</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 08/24/10.

This action is made final.

2.   Claims 52-70 are pending in the case. Claims 52, 60, 68 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a
> whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having
> ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 52-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Drenttel et al. (Patent No. US 7124360 B1; hereinafter Drenttel) in view of Butler et al.

(Patent No. 6018340; hereinafter Butler) further in view of Cohn (Pat. No. 5712995;

hereinafter Cohn).

        As to claims 52, Drenttel teaches:

        A method for organizing one or more application windows within at least one computer

display (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67), the method comprising:

        dividing the at least one computer display with one or more user-defined boundaries to

create two or more window areas within the at least one computer display (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and

col. 5 lines 1-44; the display screen is divided into grids having two or more window areas and

wherein the grid templates are user-configurable, col. 6 lines 56-67), wherein the two or more

window areas include a first window area and a second window area divided by a first boundary

(e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 5 lines 1-44; grid template includes a plurality of tiles)

associating a first application window with a first window area within the at least one

computer display based on user input (e.g., Fig. 9b and col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 7 lines 1-

28 and col. 7 lines 35-47 and lines 57-67; wherein the first section of the screen 9012 is

configured to display email information or wherein each frame being used to display data as

desired and wherein the user can reconfigure and reorganize the mosaic of information);

associating a second application window with the first window area within the at least

two computer displays based on user input (e.g., see Figs. 9a; window area 9002 shows to

include two application windows);

displaying the first application window and the second application window within the first

window area within the at least one computer display based on user input (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and

col. 7 lines 35-67; wherein each grid/frame is used to display data as desired);

wherein the first window area has no internal boundaries that further divide the first

window area (e.g., see Figs. 9a; window area 9002 shows to include two application windows

and having no internal boundaries that further divide the first window area).

Drenttel does not disclose that the computer display includes at least two or more

computer displays.

In the same field of endeavor of displaying multiple windows, Butler discloses a window

area associating with an application window (e.g., window area C as shown in Fig. 4) wherein

the window area is extended across two computer displays such that a first portion of the first

window area is within a first computer display and a second portion of the first window area is

within a second computer display (e.g., window area C in Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the grid template as taught by Drenttel to be able to use for a multiple displays as suggested by Butler to achieve the ability to display multiple application windows in a multiple displays environment because Butler suggests that the combination of the monitor spaces can be treated as a single, contiguous virtual desktop (e.g., see Butler col. 1 lines 54-59) and Drenttel also suggested that the grid template can be applicable to larger and varying screen sizes and proportions (e.g., see Drenttel col. 5 lines 35-44). As suggested by Butler, one would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce the screen clutter (e.g., see Butler col. 1 lines 42-51).

Drenttel and Butler do not teach the first window area partially overlaps the second window area.

In the same field of endeavor of multiple windows, Cohn teaches multiple window display having a plurality of window areas wherein one window area is partially overlaps another window area (e.g., see Fig. 8 and col. 13 lines 5-17, lines 38-42; tiles can be included in or form conventional overlapped windows).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have modified the grid template of Drenttel and Butler to include the feature of overlapping tiles as taught by Cohn to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is because in overlapped window interfaces, individual windows can be resized and repositioned without affecting placement and sizing of other windows (e.g., see Cohn col. 2 lines 37-40).

In regard to claim 60, claim 60 reflects the computer readable medium-comprising software instruction for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

     In regard to claim 68, claim 68 reflects the system-comprising a processor, a computer monitor, a user interface coupled to the processor for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

     In regard to claims 53 and 61, Drenttel teaches storing the one or more user-defined boundaries as a boundary layout template that is available for recall by the user (e.g., col. 6 lines 56-67 through co. 7 lines 1-28; screen templates).

     In regard to claims 54 and 62, Drenttel teaches adjusting the length associated with a first user-defined boundary in the one or more user- defined boundaries, and adjusting the two or more window areas based on the adjusted length associated with the first user-defined boundary (e.g., Fig. 3A-3C and col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 8 lines 1-4; tiles are configurable).

     In regard to claims 55 and 63, Drenttel teaches storing the association between the first application window and the first window area within the at least one computer (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67 through col. 8 lines 1-5; applications are associated with tiles in the grid template).

     In regard to claims 56 and 64, Drenttel teaches resizing the first application window to cover an entire area of the first window area within the at least one computer (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 57-67 through col. 8 lines 1-5 and col. 5 lines 14-16; tiles are resizable).

     In regard to claims 57 and 65, Drenttel further teaches resizing the first application window to cover a first portion of the first window area (e.g., Figs. 9a-9c and col. 7 lines 35-67). Drenttel does not teach the area defined by the first portion is less than an entire area of the first window area within the at least one computer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have implemented this limitation

because Drenttel suggests to the skilled artisan that the grid template can be rearranged,
reconfigured and reorganized as desired by the end user to suit his or her needs and/or tastes
(e.g., col. 6 lines 56-67 through col. 7 lines 1-3). One would have been motivated to make such
an implementation is to increase the user understanding of, and relationship to, a computer
interface through a computer screen (e.g., Drenttel col. 2 lines 23-26).

   In regard to claims 58 and 66, Drenttel the one or more user-defined boundaries are
associated with a pre-defined boundary layout template selected by the user (e.g., col. 6 lines
23-67 through col. 7 lines 1-28; screen template is selected by a user).

   In regard to claims 59, 67, 69, Drenttel further discloses each of the one or more user-
defined boundaries extends between two different sides of the at least one computer display
(e.g., Figs. 9a-9c; wherein the boundary of window area 9001' extends between two different
sides, left to right side, of the computer screen where the template area covers). Butler
discloses a window area associating with an application window (e.g., window area C as shown
in Fig. 4) wherein the window area is extended across two computer displays such that a first
portion of the first window area is within a first computer display and a second portion of the first
window area is within a second computer display (e.g., window area C in Fig. 4).

   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the
invention was made, to have modified the grid template as taught by Drenttel to be able to use
for a multiple displays as suggested by Butler to achieve the ability to display multiple
application windows in a multiple displays environment because Butler suggests that the
combination of the monitor spaces can be treated as a single, contiguous virtual desktop (e.g.,
see Butler col. 1 lines 54-59) and Drenttel also suggested that the grid template can be
applicable to larger and varying screen sizes and proportions (e.g., see Drenttel col. 5 lines 35-

44). As suggested by Butler, one would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce the screen clutter (e.g., see Butler col. 1 lines 42-51).

5.   **Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drenttel, Butler and Cohn as applied to claim 52 and further in view of DeStefano (6075531; DeStefano).**

In regard to claim 70, Drenttel, Butler and Cohn teach the limitations of claim 52 for the samer reasons as set forth in claim 52 above. Drenttel and Butler do not teach at least one of the one or more user-defined boundaries is not a straight line.

However, this deficiency is disclosed by DeStefano. DeStefano teaches a display area having multiple windows (e.g., see Fig. 10). DeStefano teaches a window boundary can be in other shapes such as linear or curved (e.g., col. 4 lines 23-43). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified the layout grid template of Drenttel, Butler and Cohn to include the feature of defining window boundaries to be in curved lines to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make such an implementation is to optimize the available space of the display area since content displayed in the window area is not always in a straight shaped format.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's remarks filed on 08/24/10 have been considered but are not persuasive.

   ❑   Applicant argues that Cohn reference is silent as to window areas or to the fact that the first window area overlaps the second window areas (see page 8 lines 1-2).

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Cohn teaches a configuration of three panes 210, 211, 212, wherein each pane may include one or more application window (e.g., see

Figs. 6, 8 and col. 12 lines 66-67). The term pane reads on the limitation of "window area" because it contains one or more application window. Cohn expressly suggests that certain portions of panes may be allowed to <u>overlap</u> without causing substantially overlapping of pane contents (e.g., see col. 13 lines 38-42). Therefore, Cohn teaches/suggests the first window area/pane area partially overlaps the second window/pane area.

In addition, Cohn teaches a tiler data structure defines a pane configuration in the interface (e.g., see Fig. 9 and col. 13 lines 4-5). Cohn expressly teaches that tillers may be included in or form conventional overlapped windows which can be managed with other windows and incorporated into other overlapped interfaces (e.g., see col. 13 lines 4-10). In Figure 8 and col. 12 lines 66-67, Cohn teaches an interface as being a display area including multiple panes. Therefore, both windows and interfaces (which can be overlapped) can be interpreted as window area because each can contain tiler data structure or pane within.

Thus, Cohn teaches first window area partially overlaps a second window area.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TuyetLien T Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179